## **REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claims 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that claims 14-16 are unclear because of improper dependency on subsequent claims as a claim can only depend from a single previous claim. Claim 17 is objected to due to its dependency on claim 16.

On October 22, 2004 a telephone interview between the Examiner and counsel for the applicant revealed that the applicant's amendment filed previously in this matter amended claims 14-16 by striking the number 4 and, in its place, adding the number 18. However, due to a word processing glitch, the strikeout line through the number 4 was not easily detectible by the Examiner. Accordingly, the claims are resubmitted herewith as previously amended but more clearly indicating the strike-through line over the number 4 in claims 14-16. Claims 14-16 depend only from claim 18, which was found to be allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 14-16 are believed to be allowable. Likewise, claim 17 depends from claim 16 and is also believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the aforegoing rejections and allow claims 14-17.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 502093.

Respectfully submitted,

SAANE M. NIEBERGALL Registration No. 44,974

THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL Attorneys of Record

2120 South 72nd Street, Suite 1111 Omaha, NE 68124 (402) 392-2280

## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

15

10

1

5

20

25